



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/617,669	07/17/2000	Eric P. Traut	MSFT-2118/304101.01	8184
41505	7590	07/18/2006		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			EXAMINER	CHUONG, TRUC T
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2179

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/617,669	TRAUT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Truc T. Chuong	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the communication, filed 04/27/06.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 11, and 12 are independent claims. This action is made final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Madden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,503 B1) in view of Multiple Bootable Operating System of IBM technical Disclosure Bulletin (Hereinafter IBM, June 1, 1992, pages 1-4).

As to claim 1, Madden teaches a computer system for running one or more software applications, wherein the software applications are suitable for generating a video output, said single computer system comprising:

a host operating system suitable for displaying a graphical user interface (graphical user interface support on a computer, e.g., col. 5 lines 1-9, and figs. 2, 3 & 6);

multiple emulated operating systems being emulated by one or more emulator programs running on the host operating system (the system for managing multiple operating systems on the computer, and the single menu for listing all available operating systems and operating system modes on that computer, e.g., col. 5 lines 1-9, lines 46-50, and fig. 6), wherein at least two of the multiple operating systems are being simultaneously emulated (Madden implies that there are at

least two operating systems are emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6, and they are simultaneously working in the background because the system of Madden clearly states that to support more than one operating system in a given hard drive partition (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59), which is divided the hard drive into different segments, and the system is capable of switching different operating modes (e.g., col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4); therefore, the system of Madden and its operating systems are simultaneously working in the background and being emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6. Alternatively, if Madden does not clearly provide such feature, IBM clearly teaches that the system permits simultaneous emulation of different operating systems to be run on a single machine by separate partitioned region on a hard disk drive (similar to Madden as mentioned above) (IBM, e.g., page 1). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to modify the system of Madden having the feature of IBM to help to tie different OSs together so that the user can gain the advantage of synergy between different OSs, in middle of page 1); and

wherein the host operating system is able to display for a user a reduced-size (Madden, e.g. fig. 6) that are being operated in a background mode (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59, col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4, and fig. 6);

As to claim 2, Madden teaches the computer system of claim 1, further comprising one or more virtual video memory components suitable for storing the video output of the emulated operating systems (e.g., col. 5 lines 1-9, lines 46-50, and fig. 6).

As to claim 6, Madden teaches the computer system of claim 1, wherein the graphical user interface is a windowing environment suitable for displaying one or more windows (e.g., 2, 3 & 6); and

wherein the portion of the graphical user interface comprising the reduced-size representation is a window (Madden implies that there are at least two operating systems are emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6).

As to claim 8, it is individually similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 9, Madden teaches the computer system of claim 8, wherein the reduced-size representations are representations of the video outputs of the virtual machines that are being operated in the background mode (they are simultaneously working in the background because the system of Madden clearly states that to support more than one operating system in a given hard drive partition (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59), which is divided the hard drive into different segments, and the system is capable of switching different operating modes (e.g., col. 9 line 37- col. 10 line 4).

As to claim 10, the modified Madden teaches the computer system of claim 9, further comprising a virtual video memory associated with each of the virtual machines (Madden, e.g., col. 6 lines 5-10, IBM, virtual machine, in middle of page 1); and wherein the reduced-size representations are generated from the video information stored in the virtual video memory associated with each virtual machine (e.g., col. 6 lines 5-10, and fig. 6).

As to claim 11, the modified Madden teaches a method for displaying a reduced-size image of multiple emulated computer systems executing on a single computer system, wherein at least two of the multiple computer systems are being simultaneously emulated, said method comprising the steps of:

suspending one or more of the multiple emulated computer systems by saving to memory in the host computer system the image of the emulated computer system (Madden implies that there are at least two operating systems are emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6, and they are simultaneously working in the background because the system of Madden clearly states that to support more than one operating system in a given hard drive partition (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59), which is divided the hard drive into different segments, and the system is capable of switching different operating modes (e.g., col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4); reading in at the emulator program from memory in the host computer system the image of the suspended emulated computer system (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59); interpreting in the emulator program the contents of the saved image of the suspended emulated computer system (e.g., col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4); displaying a reduced-size representation of the suspended emulated computer system (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59, col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4, and fig. 6).

As to claim 12, Madden teaches a method for displaying a reduced-size image of multiple emulated computer systems executing on a single computer system, wherein at least two of the multiple computer systems are being simultaneously emulated, said method comprising the steps of:

reading in at the emulator program from memory in the host computer system the image of the emulated computer system; interpreting in the emulator program the contents of the image of the emulated computer system (Note the rejection of claim 11 above);

displaying a reduced-size representation of the emulated computer system (Note the rejection of claim 11 above);

periodically updating the reduced-size representation of the emulated computer system (each of the plurality operating systems of Madden is running in the background as mentioned above; therefore, each thumbnail icon is also updated to reflect the current status).

As to claims 13-15, and 17-20, they are method claims of system claims 1, 1, 2, 8, 1, 9, and 10. Note the rejections of claims 1, 1, 2, 8, 1, 9, and 10 above respectively.

2. Claims 3-5, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403) in view of Multiple Bootable Operating System of IBM technical Disclosure Bulletin (Hereinafter IBM, June 1, 1992, pages 1-4), and further in view of Ote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,367,628).

As to claim 3, the modified Madden in view of IBM teaches the computer system of claim 2, but the modified Madden does not teach wherein one or more of the video memory components are VRAM memory. Ote clearly teaches VRAM memory (col. 4 lines 47-56, and figs. 2-3). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have this highly desirable feature of Ote's VRAM into the modified system of Madden to provide fast-block-transfer access to the internal memory.

As to claim 4, the modified Madden teaches the computer system of claim 1, wherein the emulated operating systems operating in a background mode are active (each of the plurality operating systems of Madden is running in the background as mentioned above; therefore, each thumbnail icon is also updated to reflect the current status), and one or more thumbnail images (e.g., fig. 6); but the modified Madden does not clearly show wherein information stored on the video memory components at predetermined intervals. Ote clearly teaches periodically transfer

display text and image data, col. 3 lines 50-55, and col. 4 lines 47-55). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to add Ote's time interval into the modified system of Madden to update displayed information.

As to claim 5, Madden teaches the computer system of claim 4, wherein the predetermined intervals are such that the thumbnail images are real-time representations of the video output from the active software applications (Madden implies that there are at least two operating systems are emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6, and each of the plurality of operating systems of Madden is running in the background as mentioned above; therefore, each thumbnail icon is also updated to reflect the current status).

As to claim 16, this is a method claim of system claim 3. Note the rejection of claim 3 above.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403) in view of Multiple Bootable Operating System of IBM technical Disclosure Bulletin (Hereinafter IBM, June 1, 1992, pages 1-4), and further in view of Brett (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,471).

As to claim 7, the modified Madden does not teach the reduced-size representations are created using a bilinear sampling technique; however, Brett clearly describes the bilinear sampling technique in his High-definition Digital Video Processing System (col. 10 lines 58-74 and col. 11 lines 1-11). It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have this data reduction feature of Brett's bilinear

sampling technique into the modified system of Madden to improve performance and quality in graphic data loading process (Brett, e.g., col. 11 lines 1-10).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 04/27/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued and Examiner disagrees with the following reasons:

a. *Madden does not teach wherein at least tow of the multiple operating systems are being simultaneously emulated."*

Madden clearly teaches the system for managing multiple operating systems on the computer, and the single menu for listing all available operating systems and operating system modes on that computer (e.g., col. 5 lines 1-9, lines 46-50, and fig. 6); and Madden implies that there are at least two operating **systems** are emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6, and they are simultaneously working in the background because the system of Madden clearly states that to support more than one operating system in a given hard drive partition (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59), which is divided the hard drive into different segments, and the system is capable of switching different operating modes (e.g., col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4). Therefore, the system of Madden and its operating systems are simultaneously working in the background and being emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6. Alternatively, if Madden does not clearly provide such feature, IBM clearly teaches that the system permits simultaneous emulation of different operating systems to be run on a single machine by separate partitioned region on a hard

disk drive, and IBM also teaches that the concept of running multiple OSs on a single computer so that the user can gain the advantage of **synergy** between different OSs (similar to Madden as mentioned above) (IBM, e.g., page 1). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to modify the system of Madden having the feature of IBM to help to tie different OSs together so that the user can gain the advantage of synergy between different OSs, in middle of page 1.

b. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Madden clearly suggests the system for managing multiple operating systems on the computer, and the single menu for listing all available operating systems and operating system modes on that computer (e.g., col. 5 lines 1-9, lines 46-50, and fig. 6); and Madden implies that there are at least two operating **systems** are emulated as thumbnail icons shown in fig. 6, and they are simultaneously working in the background because the system of Madden clearly states that to support more than one operating system in a given hard drive

partition (e.g., col. 8 lines 46-59), which is divided the hard drive into different segments, and the system is capable of switching different operating modes (e.g., col. 9 line 37-col. 10 line 4). It is well known in the art that a single machine can run multiple OSs simultaneously as explained above, and the MBOS of IBM is just bringing more detail evidences showing the concept of running multiple OSs on a single computer so that the user can gain the advantage of **synergy** between different OSs. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to modify the system of Madden having the feature of IBM to help to tie different OSs together so that the user can gain the advantage of synergy between different OSs, in middle of page 1.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T. Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Truc T. Chuong

07/08/06

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

